

***NCLB***  
Committee of Practitioners  
Paradise Valley Unified District  
District Administration Building  
15002 North 32<sup>nd</sup> Street  
January 10, 2003

**Meeting Minutes**

Attendees

**COP MEMBERS**

Julia Ayres  
Christine Bejarano  
Marge Carrithers  
Steve Chambers  
Karen Copley  
Kaye Dean  
Shelly Duran  
Robert Edgar  
Diane Fox  
Tim Frey  
Marty Hurst  
Maureen Irr  
Bruce Iverson  
Sylvia Johnson  
Mary Anne Kapp  
Robert Klee  
Patricia Osborne

Lois Lamar  
Jean Lewis  
Norma Malamud  
Patricia Marsh  
Jill Martinez  
Mary McIntyre  
Joe O'Reilly  
Alejandro Perez  
Gail Powell  
Catherine Steele  
Julie Thayer  
Lynn Thompson  
Barbara U'Ren  
Deone Wiley

**ADE**

Stacie Hacker  
Garett Holm  
Ildi Laczko-Kerr  
Carrie Larson  
Pat Loughrin  
Muriel Rosmann  
Nancy Stahl  
Kim Strehlow

**GUESTS**

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Mary McIntyre and Kaye Dean opened the meeting at 9:07 am. The group broke into subcommittees with the purpose of highlighting progress made toward goals. At 9:47 a.m. the COP meeting began with subcommittee reports.

**Effective Practices Committee:**

Marge Carrithers mentioned that the committee has two main goals. The first is to assist LEAs with understanding scientifically based research. The second goal deals with adding a link to the ADE website regarding best practices. The link has been added to the COP page of the ADE website. However, there was a little confusion as to how to find the link. You can find it by going to the Academic Support page, click on the link to Title I and then, click on the COP link. The Best Practices link is there. There is a committee working on the scientifically based research workshop. Additional information should be forthcoming. There is a state committee that has been working on

reading programs. Lynn Thompson has been an active participant. A list of recommended reading programs should be out soon.

### **Recognition Committee:**

Shelly Duran highlighted the Recognition Committee's progress. We are sending two Distinguished Graduates to the National Title I Conference in Anaheim, CA. Nancy Stahl invited any COP members who will be attending the conference to sit at the Arizona table during the Distinguished Graduate recognition. This year we were unable to participate in the Title I Distinguished School program. The ranking criteria included information regarding schools showing the greatest gains in all disaggregated subgroups. Hopefully, we will be able to participate in the program for next year.

### **Membership Committee**

Steve Chambers updated the COP on the Emeritus status. A motion was made to put a description of this status into the Operating Guidelines. It was unanimously passed. A notification will go out each year to notify members who are eligible to be an Emeritus member.

### **Implementation Committee:**

Norma Malamud addressed some of the issues that LEAs are facing regarding the implementation of NCLB. First, there needs to be some clarification as to the parameters of paraprofessional qualifications. Do the 60 hour credits required for the "high quality" paraprofessional status need to be instructional credits? Second, the 20% set aside for Public School Choice and Supplemental Services needs to be looked at. Once the deadline is passed and the LEA can reallocate those set-asides, how are they to be distributed? Has ADE established any weighted formulas? Are LEAs to give more to underperforming schools? On a per pupil basis? This is important so that LEAs will be able to pass an audit. Third, the committee was concerned about Supplemental Services in rural areas. At this time, there are only services for grades 5-12. What should LEAs do in the meantime to provide Supplemental Services to students younger than grade 5? Fourth, there is a lack of communication/awareness at most LEAs regarding which schools need to turn in School Improvement plans to the ADE. At this time, only those schools that received an Underperforming label need to turn in a plan to the state. Schools that received Maintaining or Improving labels do not need to send a plan to ADE. Fifth, will there be an extension for schools identified for school improvement. This year has given schools only four months to implement their school improvement plan. Will the failing label be put off for another year so that schools have adequate time to implement their plans? Finally, is there a template for the Final NCLB Consolidated Plan? There is concern that LEAs will not have adequate time to write the plan before the June 30 deadline.

### **Accountability Committee:**

Julie Thayer presented the Accountability Committee's concerns regarding NCLB. First, the committee recommends that Arizona offer the Stanford 9 test in the fall and AIMS in the Spring. Both assessments are required to fulfill the law, but taking them both in the same month takes away from instructional time and is difficult for schools and LEAs. Second, the data disaggregation requirement of NCLB is a concern. There is limited availability of the free and reduced lunch data. Additionally, there is confusion as to how many students are too few to report. Is the minimum 10 students per school? per grade? Some clarification would be helpful. Finally, there are concerns regarding Special Ed students and accountability. Are these students able to take an alternative assessment? How is Arizona dealing with the question of out-of-level testing?

### **Consolidated State Application – Garrett Holm/Ildi Laczko-Kerr**

Garrett presented ADE's progress toward submitting the Consolidated State Application (or Accountability Workbook) to the U.S. Department of Education. It is due by January 31, 2003. In it, ADE explains our current state accountability system under AZ LEARNS and defines adequate yearly progress (AYP). Currently, five state's accountability systems have been approved. They are Massachusetts, Indiana, Ohio, New York and Colorado. Our accountability system is similar to both Indiana's and Ohio's.

The first step in the process for submission is to submit our Accountability Workbook to the U.S. Department of Education by January 31. It will then go through a peer review process. Peer review teams will consist of approximately 2-3 people. Sometime in the middle of February, the peer review team will make a state visit and make recommendations to the application. ADE must then modify the plan and submit it by May 1, 2003.

Under AZ LEARNS, there are five major inconsistencies with the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law. First, AZ LEARNS does not have an evaluation or identification process for LEAs. There is no provision for this in state statute. The current administration hopes to address this through State Board regulation. Second, AZ LEARNS was developed without annual measurable objectives in mind. Third, AZ LEARNS does not include intermediate goals. NCLB requires that states adopt annual measurable objectives and intermediate goals. It is hoped that ADE will be able to tie these goals and objectives to the growth point model of AZ LEARNS. Fourth, there is an inconsistency with the release date of Achievement Profiles. State statute requires profiles to be released by October 15. NCLB requires this data to be released by the first day of school. In order to release Achievement Profiles any earlier in the year, we would have to work with the testing company. Fifth, NCLB requires an analysis of disaggregated data. Currently, we do not have a system in place to disaggregate this information statewide. In addition, data may not be accurate and reliable.

Our starting point for NCLB was the initial Achievement Profiles from October 2002. The timeline for improvement is 12 years to show 100% of students proficient on the

state academic standards in reading and math. As stated earlier, it is hoped that ADE will be able to tie the goals and objectives to the growth point groupings. That way schools and LEAs will have an answer to the question, “how much do I need to improve next year to get out of school improvement?”

Superintendent Horne has recognized the concern regarding labeling schools as “Failing” as soon as next fall. The concern is that the classification doesn’t accurately reflect the data. In addition, schools will not have had enough time to implement their school improvement plans. This issue will have to go before the legislature to extend the timeline.

AZ LEARNS currently has a provision for a site review. However, at this time the site review doesn’t have enough weight to make a difference in a school’s classification. It is Superintendent Horne’s position that the review needs to serve a purpose. He will be going to the legislature in order to give more strength to the review.

As to the question of evaluating LEAs for improvement, ADE needs to come up with a similar methodology to identifying schools for improvement. We may be able to aggregate school level data from the Achievement Profiles in order to evaluate LEAs.

The AZ LEARNS Accountability Workgroup has, up to this point, been an invaluable, though temporary, advisory group to ADE through this process. The Standards and Accountability Division would like to expand the membership of the group to include practitioners with diverse backgrounds. This workgroup would have the task of tackling some of the issues described above. Garrett extended an invitation to interested COP members.

#### **AZ LEARNS TECHNICAL MANUAL – Ildi Laczko-Kerr**

The Technical Manual is in the final stages of being completed. This manual describes the procedures that went into the implementation of AZ LEARNS and the release of the Achievement Profiles. It is written in an understandable way and describes how the calculations were done and the methodology of the profiles. The very last component of the manual is a step-by-step guide to calculating a school’s Achievement Profile using test data. This section, which will also be published as a stand-alone piece, will be very useful to schools and LEAs in anticipating their classification each year. The manual will be available on the ADE website by the end of January. The stand-alone piece will be sent out to LEAs around the same time.

#### **SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH WORKSHOP – Ildi Laczko-Kerr**

Ildi has been participating in a working group along with NCCSR, WestEd and several other state departments to put together a workshop for practitioners defining scientifically based research (SBR). This has been specifically targeted to schools engaged in Comprehensive School Reform, however, can be useful to any school going through the school improvement process. At this point, the workshop is almost finalized. Ildi has

volunteered Arizona as a pilot site for the workshop. It is a trainer of trainers method, so that participants will be able to come away with the materials necessary to train others in the same way. The workshop will consist of an overview of basic research principals, the step-by-step process schools can use to evaluate a piece of research against the “gold-standard” of SBR and materials that participants can go home with to refer to in the future. Members of the COP indicated an interest in having this workshop presented to them. They suggested March 6, 2003 as a possible date.

### **SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS/EXTERNAL FACILITATORS – Carrie Larson**

NCLB requires states to set aside funds to be allocated to schools for School Improvement. This year Arizona has approximately \$3.2 million to allocate to low-performing schools. The grant will be similar to the Title I Accountability grant, however, instead of focusing on the school improvement planning process, the focus will be on the implementation of the plan.

There are 112 schools eligible for this grant pending State Board approval. Eligibility was based on those Title I schools that have been identified for either their first or second year of improvement and that received an Underperforming label on their 2002 Achievement Profile.

The base grant amount remains at \$30,000. However, schools may be eligible for additional funds based on two sets of criteria: priority status and location. Schools in their 2<sup>nd</sup> year of improvement that received an Underperforming label on their 2002 Achievement Profile are identified as ‘priority’ schools. These schools, if they receive another Underperforming label on the next profile, will be identified for Corrective Action. These schools are eligible for an additional \$7,500. Schools that are outside of either Maricopa or Pima counties are considered “rural” schools and are eligible for an additional \$5,000. The following breakdown shows the number of schools eligible for various funds:

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| 35 Priority/not rural schools@ \$37,500 =    | \$1,312,500 |
| 31 Priority/rural schools @ \$42,500 =       | \$1,317,500 |
| 33 Improvement/not rural schools@ \$30,000 = | \$990,000   |
| 15 Improvement/rural schools @ \$35,000 =    | \$525,000   |

At the same time that schools will be notified of grant eligibility, ADE is revamping the External Facilitator system based on recommendations made by RMC Research. All current External Facilitators will be required to reapply for their positions. Applications will be mailed to all EFs in the next week and due on February 14, 2003.

External Facilitator duties are going to change slightly due to the fact that schools receiving the grant will be implementing their plans as opposed to going through a planning process. EFs will be required to analyze the school improvement plan to make recommendations, if needed. Next, EFs will assist the school in the implementation of

their plan. As the school is implementing its plan, EFs will monitor progress toward benchmarks and goals. EFs will be required to attend four ADE sponsored trainings. In addition, they will be required to spend a minimum of 60 hours physically at the school site during a five month period.

As part of the school improvement grant, school improvement teams will be required to attend a Curriculum Alignment Institute held during the summer of 2003. These institutes are meant to be a proactive step for schools who may be facing Corrective Action. The intention of the institute is for school teams to be able to articulate how their curriculum is aligned to the Arizona Academic Standards and how that alignment is translated to the instructional level in the classroom.

Those schools who receive the School Improvement Grant will be eligible to apply for Comprehensive School Reform Grants in the summer of 2003. Cycle IIA schools, who received late notice in Title I Accountability Grants, will also be included in the eligible school list.

#### **ADE UPDATE – Nancy Stahl**

Nancy Stahl gave the COP members an update regarding recent changes at ADE. The International Reading Association will be holding their National Conference on May 4-8, 2003 in Orlando, FL. COP members were invited to take brochures back to their LEAs. Our new Superintendent, Tom Horne, was sworn in as of January 6, 2003. Copies of his remarks from the swearing in ceremony were distributed to COP members. He has taken a positive approach to interaction with ADE staff. There has already been department and division-wide meetings where he shared his goals with the staff. This was a time to “talk to the Superintendent.” He was very open to questions and feedback. Superintendent Horne has a strong emphasis on service to LEAs with a focus on student achievement. A copy of the ADE organizational chart was distributed. There have been some changes in the Academic Support Division. Ralph Romero is the Deputy Associate Superintendent for the division. He extended his apologies for his absence. Carrie Larson, Marion Herrera and Nancy Stahl are working as Acting Managers for three of the units in the division.

#### **Future Meeting Dates:**

**March 7, 2003**

**May 9, 2003**

**Casa Grande Elementary District**

**Alhambra Elementary District (tentative)**

Adjournment at 2:10pm.